

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING WORK SESSION
CITY OF WATERTOWN
January 13, 2014
7:00 p.m.**

Mayor Jeffrey E. Graham Presiding

Present: Council Member Roxanne M. Burns
Council Member Joseph M. Butler, Jr.
Council Member Stephen A. Jennings
Council Member Teresa R. Macaluso
Mayor Graham

Also Present: Sharon Addison, City Manager

City staff present: Kurt Hauk, Ken Mix, Jim Mills, Justin Wood, Erin Gardner, Mike Lumbis, Beth Morris, Mike Sligar, Jerry Romig

DISCUSSION

Arena Renovations – Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. Presentation - Mr. Jeri Pickett, Stantec Project Manager; Jim Maland, Recreational Facilities Engineer- Ice Arena Subject Matter Expert; Roger Kelemecz, Lead Architect

Mayor Graham welcomed the speakers to Council.

Mr. Pickett began the discussion with a PowerPoint presentation (paper copy on file in the Office of the City Clerk) and gave an overview of the agenda, including a recap of comments and concerns made at a previous Council meeting on the subject. He noted the exterior project is infrastructure based, according to the RFP, and mentioned improved roofing, entrances, parking and pavement, and exterior bathrooms. Mr. Pickett talked about interior improvements such as the lobby, lockers and showers, structural framing, lighting and spectator views. He outlined the process used to come to the presented project, including tours and visioning exercises regarding the facility. A prioritization matrix was developed and a location bar was set on the list of new projects for the arena dividing what is in budget and what exceeds the budget. He further explained that all those items rated as 3, 4 or 5 would be included in the plan.

Mr. Maland addressed Council with his portion of the presentation entitled What's Hot on Ice, and picked out the areas of his presentation that were pertinent to the issues discussed about the arena. He mentioned a specific area where guests to the building would be able to locate an employee, or a control desk, where visitors can be directed to various parts of the facility. Mr. Maland noted another important issue, which is separating circulation streams of visitors, athletic teams and the Zamboni, whose paths should never cross, he said. He spoke about the increase in the number of women playing hockey and the need for more locker rooms for women. Back-loaded bleachers are becoming more prevalent, he said, and explained that the front row starts at the dasherboard and creates an improved viewing experience. In addition, more arenas are adding WiFi and power receptacles to seating areas. He also mentioned the addition of more storage, improved ventilation and other off-season elements. With

regard to music events, the new arena could have a better acoustical design, with a low-emissivity ceiling, acoustical block and enhanced geometry.

Other off-ice amenities he mentioned are a weight room, a cardiovascular center and artificial practice ice or shooting stations. The cardiovascular center would be a multi-purpose room, essentially, used for meetings and assemblies. He mentioned some support facilities to enhance programming options, such as a party room, a special sound space, event lighting and rink dividers.

Also discussed was a waste heat recovery system which can provide practically free heat, upgraded dasherboard technology, perimeter netting. Refrigeration systems and materials were discussed, and Mr. Maland said the current refrigerant (R-22) at the arena is phased out and any new material that the City receives is from companies that have been storing it. If there is a significant leak in the facility, he said, the price of R-22 would create a substantial bill just to replace what is currently in the system. He discussed both multi-level lighting and natural light. A smarter HVAC system would improve efficiency without compromising performance, he said.

Mr. Maland spoke about ADA necessitations and that there are more requirements for elevators in public venues. He said it is important to speak with local Code officials to make sure a defined and agreed upon method of moving forward with access for everyone is in place. He showed the layout of the team, penalty and scorer's boxes under the new design; he explained the location of the backloaded bleachers; an upgraded skate rental area and upgraded team room. As far as off-ice amenities, he showed conceptual photos of an improved lobby and concession area, concession stand, eating and drinking venue and a split room for meetings or parties, which would create some additional revenue. The cost of the overall facility can sometimes be dictated by the type of shell or scheme on the structure, and he showed the various types of materials available.

Mr. Pickett discussed some concerns from last meeting, including the number of restroom facilities, which is based on occupancy, and during large music events he said it would require a higher number of restrooms. One idea, he said, is that any additional built-in restrooms would be sufficient for ice events but entertainment or music promoters would need to provide port-o-potties for larger gatherings. It would reduce square footage costs associated with those facilities, he said. He mentioned an elevator for a second floor addition would cost approximately \$60,000 installed. The cost for revamping the existing ice rink was not included and he noted that the current one is nearly 40 years old and should be a consideration in the project. The arena will be able to handle the weight of photovoltaic panels, he said, and suggested doing it while putting on a new roof so the roof warranties are tied in to the PV installation. The challenge could be with payback due to City utility agreements, he said. There are opportunities to affect the overall budget, he said, and to phase the project if there are benefits to that. The areas that there is control over are programming, size of the spaces and quality of the materials.

Discussion centered around capitalizing on advertising opportunities to increase revenue. He again mentioned using the phased approach to the project, to be done in four phases, which could help with the cost of the project or it may add some increased costs relative to the project being spread out. Mr. Kelemecz explained the phased approach with phase one including existing building renovations and infrastructure upgrades; phase two consists of a front building addition; phase three is the rear building addition, and phase four would include site and parking improvements, which could be combined with any of the other three phases. He explained that they looked at "original option three," which was the largest footprint, applied square foot and other costs and it came out to the current phase one, which

includes interior renovation work. The total, he said, came to about \$3.5 million. Costs for phase two, consisting of the build-out for the concession stand, skate rental and restroom facilities, totaled roughly \$3.2 million. Phase three, including the bathroom facility, Privateer locker room and office space came to \$1.6 million while the parking lot expansion is just shy of \$400,000. Mr. Kelemecz added that the total budget for all four phases is \$8.8 million.

Mayor Graham inquired in what phase the new roof would be added.

Mr. Pickett replied that it would be done in phase one, which would include all the infrastructure and rework of existing facilities. It does not, however, include the ice sheet.

Mayor Graham commented that that project would consist of an entire new concrete floor.

Mr. Pickett said it would.

Mr. Maland reviewed other improvement options, shown as sketched in the presentation, which include an added arcade and pro shop. He mentioned making available bathroom facilities during the summer months and being able to cordon off portions of the restrooms depending on the season.

Council Member Burns asked how many restroom facilities would be offered to the public.

Mr. Kelemecz responded there would be three facilities for men and three for women.

Mayor Graham pointed out the presentation depicted offices for arena staff as being an open counter area within the arena.

Mr. Maland replied that it would be located where the concession stand is.

On the issue of supervision, Mayor Graham said clerical staff offices would be located in the far right corner of the building.

Mr. Pickett noted that what was originally envisioned was that there would be a control area with a staff member ready to receive the public.

Mayor Graham asked how often people come in to the arena needing assistance to set something up or with questions and noted this proposed layout is alright, but not the best.

Mr. Kelemecz said another option is to have an outside door located much closer to the offices with a sign outside letting the public know the offices are there.

Mayor Graham inquired if the building can be expanded on the sides or if the roof line is insufficient.

Mr. Kelemecz said for a single story expansion, it would be ok.

Mr. Pickett mentioned a rendering of “original option three” is available to view during the meeting, located on the easel.

Council Member Butler commented that option three was the most expensive in the original drawings.

Mr. Pickett said that is correct, and the reason it is shown is because that has the most extensive programming at this point.

Council Member Butler asked what was being eliminated, and noted the second floor was let go on this proposal.

Mr. Pickett replied that the second floor is still part of the plan.

Council Member Butler noted that a lounge for employees and showers could be eliminated.

Mr. Pickett said that based on the last meeting, there was a lot of discussion on what the overall budget was. He said he wanted to show Council that it could be a phased project and that he tried to be realistic with the dollar amounts listed, mentioning contingencies, escalation costs and FF & E.

Council Member Macaluso asked if there is a difference if the project is done in phases or all at once.

Mr. Maland replied that the phases were broken down by geometry of the existing facility and the practical matter is that if phase one is done, that displaces the management area, and to have an operable facility, phase one needs to be done with a certain level of phase two, which would be enough to create operational quarters for staff. Phase three consists of amenities that the arena currently does not have, he said.

Council Member Macaluso reiterated that the overall cost of the project, no matter how it is approached, is \$8.8 million, if it is done all at one time or if it is phased in.

Kurt Hauk, City Engineer, commented that the focus tonight is to get a scope and the goal at the end of this process is to give Stantec a scope from which they will do a design for the City. If costs are going to be reduced, he said functions and scope need to be scaled back.

Council Member Butler noted that he is curious as to what has been eliminated from the previous drawings. He mentioned an arcade room, aerobics room and a second floor lounge, restroom and shower which have not been taken out. He added that there is no need for a weight room or aerobics room because the City is not in that business and there is a YMCA a few hundred yards away and the City is not competing with them. Initially, he said he was against the arcade idea, but it could be a source of revenue.

Mr. Pickett replied that nothing has been eliminated program-wise, and those areas just mentioned are purely square footages.

Mayor Graham said it looks like there are a lot of adjustments and contingencies, and asked about the potential hazards of the refrigeration system. He asked how likely it is that the cost of the project would escalate by the revelation that the floor would have to be redone.

Mr. Maland replied that their company usually sees sheets of ice need replacement as early as 10 or 12 years, but typically they last 25 to 35 years. The arena floor now, he said, is 40 plus years old. He said he would recommend the floor be redone during this project as well.

Mayor Graham asked what that would involve.

Mr. Maland answered that in dollar amounts, it is probably \$500,000 to \$600,000 dollars to do the floor. For refrigeration and equipment it would be another \$500,000 or so, he said.

Mayor Graham inquired what is most likely to fail, the floor or the refrigeration system.

Mr. Maland said usually the equipment goes first, but noted the arena's equipment is newer. The floor, however, has not been replaced. He added that it is impossible to tell but some testing could be done, but during the pressure testing process, damage could be done to the floor.

If the floor failed in five or ten years, Mayor Graham asked how much of a disruption it would be to the facility to replace it.

Mr. Maland noted that if it went down unexpectedly, it would put that area out of commission for a long time. If it was planned, the construction piece could be a two to three month period.

Council and the Stantec team discussed energy efficiency differences concerning refrigerant systems.

Mayor Graham commented that it would be better to include replacement of the mechanicals as it relates to ice and less of the extra programming rooms.

Mr. Pickett noted that the current design has a very odd flow and is nowhere near what the standards are today and if certain upgrades are not met, the project would be moving forward with an old-fashioned space. The team room area and management area needs significant help moving forward, he said.

Council Member Butler asked if the life expectancy of the floors reflects year-round ice use.

Mr. Maland explained that he was drawing a general time frame based on different systems being used and noted in the City's system, the headers would be the most vulnerable.

Council Member Butler questioned the necessity and cost of the second floor addition.

Mr. Pickett replied that most rinks today are building back-loaded bleachers, which means there must be an elevator to get to that level. He said it is less expensive to build second floor square footage in a consolidated footprint than it is to sprawl out and make a larger footprint. One possibility is to put the elevator in, and perhaps not finish all of the second floor space but at least design it, and as program development becomes available expand into that area. He added that building bleachers that are not back-loaded would be moving backwards.

Council discussed the bleachers and what would be permanent or collapsible sections, and that the home-ice side would be permanent bleachers. Discussion also centered on the location of the press and team boxes and if they moved to the far side of the ice, players would potentially cross paths with the

Zamboni. It was mentioned that it would be best if the paths of the players, spectators and Zamboni did not cross.

Council Member Butler asked how much additional seating would be provided on the second floor.

Mr. Kelemecz said a new seating area would add an additional 1,500 seats.

Mr. Hauk noted that if there is no second floor, then expansion has to be pushed out horizontally which would impact parking areas.

Mr. Pickett commented that the list of priorities can be worked with, relative to the budget.

Council Member Butler said that he was at the arena recently with his daughter and noticed some of the flaws, such as the restrooms, the locker rooms, bleachers and said the entryway was very congested. He noted that the City also has to add another court room and it was not expected that the arena would need a new floor, either, adding that there are a lot of big numbers being thrown at Council. He also asked about the urgency of the parking issue.

Erin Gardner, Parks and Recreation Superintendent, replied it is very critical, especially in the winter because cars are parked on both sides of the already narrow streets creating a nearly impassable area for emergency vehicles.

Mayor Graham asked where the Privateers would be located during the various renovation phases, and mentioned they could use one of the renovated locker rooms. He mentioned there is a question as to the long term viability of professional hockey in small markets. To build something specifically with the Privateers' name on it poses its own risks, he said.

Council Member Butler said he agreed.

The Mayor said his biggest concern was public facilities, safety, traffic flow, decent restrooms and concessions and acceptable locker rooms.

Council Member Macaluso questioned the referee locker rooms with showers.

Ms. Gardner replied that they are required and that is the reason why \$30,000 was put into the facility last year. It is a necessity for the Privateers, she added, but noted that other groups can use them when the Privateers are not there.

It was discussed that although they were added recently, because of the complete renovation, the referee locker/shower rooms will have to be constructed again for this project.

Mayor Graham asked if the \$60,000 elevator is a minimal amenity that would satisfy the occasional disabled individual or is it a higher use elevator. He added that in most game situations, he thinks people would utilize the stairs rather than the elevator.

Mr. Kelemecz replied that it is an elevator similar to the one in City Hall and would satisfy the ADA requirements.

Council Member Butler noted that the second floor would command better views for those in wheelchairs.

Council Member Burns agreed that the elevator is something that is non-negotiable.

Mr. Hauk said he had a discussion with Shawn McWayne, Code Enforcement Supervisor, after the last meeting and the requirement that has to be met is that handicapped guests have to be provided with a comparable experience within the crowd.

Mr. Pickett noted that there has to be a companion chair in place as well, noting that there is ample space available at the top portion of the bleachers.

Council Member Butler inquired about the arrangement at concerts.

Ms. Gardner replied that it is up to the performer and mentioned that at DPAO concerts, their clients sit up front near the stage.

Council Member Burns reiterated that the DPAO employees bring the clients to the designated areas.

Mayor Graham noted that as far as a decision, what he is hearing is that there is more tentativeness about phase three, but there is some interest in fixing the refrigeration issues and perhaps there are some amenities that staff would want to trim out.

Council Member Butler commented that if phase three is cut, the total is still just over \$7 million, which is still more than what he wants to spend. From his standpoint, he said he wants the arena to be hockey strong, concert strong and have a high level of comfort with ample space and good bathrooms. The upstairs shower and lounge area are not a priority, he said.

Council Member Burns said this was a nice presentation which offered different options and she said she appreciates the fact that the representatives from Stantec put the process into phases, if the City decides to go that route. This is a lot to ingest, however, and she said she would like to hear back from Parks and Recreation staff and get a priority list from them. She said Council has articulated what they feel is important to them and the staff at Parks and Recreation understands that the City needs to watch every dollar that it can, but Parks and Rec staff are the ones that have the hands on experience as to what they feel would be the better utilization of the dollars and space available at the arena.

Mayor Graham asked what the time frame is for the scope and starting on the design.

Mr. Hauk replied that the scope needs to be finalized first and then from that scope the supplemental agreement to do the design. The question is whether there is enough information and feedback to move forward. He said it boils down to what will the cost be and will the City do the project in phases or not. The more times the arena shuts down for phases, they run the risk for losing users.

Mayor Graham commented that from a finance perspective, if this is being phased in annual increments there is a related cost.

Jim Mills, City Comptroller, said the bonding could go as far as 25 years because of its classification as a Class A building.

Council Member Butler said the parking lot phase would not be difficult and most likely the City would not have to bond for that.

Mayor Graham said he understands Council Member Burns' view of wanting more feedback but on the other hand he asked how many more changes there are going to be and what is the Council's tolerance for \$8 million.

Council Member Butler and Council Member Macaluso commented that they do not have a lot of tolerance for that figure.

Mayor Graham asked if staff wanted to come back with a list of priorities.

Mr. Hauk replied that they could try that but the biggest issue, he said, is certain functions have to be removed in order for the price to go down. He suggested putting a list together and showing a "cut line" so Council will see what is no longer on the priority list.

If this is going to be done on the basis of a "cut line," Mayor Graham said he would think staff would want to analyze what the different totals would bring in terms of debt service. He added that he does not want to see the process drag on indefinitely. If the full amount of \$8 million was bonded over 25 years, it is \$375,000 per year just for principal.

Mr. Mills noted his figures reflect a four percent interest rate, using level debt service, with the first year starting out at a debt service of \$700,000 and on the 25th year it is down to \$367,000. The 25 year average is \$537,000 per year in debt. It can be done as level debt service, which is principal plus interest which is the same amount for 25 years or the City could do level principal payments, which is the way he said he processes debt so the principal is being paid off sooner.

Council Member Jennings commented that he is taking all the information in but said that he thought the cost was high and that he is very interested in what the Comptroller thinks.

Mr. Hauk said that something could be put together from the staff level from the Comptroller regarding debt issues; Ms. Gardner and her staff for function issues, and attempt to come up with a reasonable cut line and come back during a work session in February to rehash where staff is.

Mayor Graham mentioned that if it were a nicer facility then the City could command more reasonable market rates for rents rather than just giving it away.

Ms. Gardner noted that the arena's current fees of \$70 per hour are much lower than those around the area, which are averaging \$100 per hour.

Mayor Graham said if Council has any questions, they do not have to wait until next meeting and suggested contacting staff before then.

Council Member Butler asked if this could be discussed before the February work session meeting.

Mayor Graham suggested meeting on the fourth Monday in January or if it is not a long discussion, it could be included in next week's meeting.

Council Member Burns said if everyone has enough opportunity to garner as much information as they thought necessary from staff in advance, the discussion could be tagged on to the Council meeting.

Mayor Graham commented that he agrees it was an excellent presentation, with a lot of expertise brought to the table. He concluded by saying he would like to try to get this wrapped up by the fourth Monday in January.

Ms. Addison told Council that pushing the issue out until the February work session allows the staff more time to put together the remaining capital projects.

Mayor Graham said that decision will be made next week.

Mr. Pickett thanked Council for their time and consideration.

Council took a brief recess at 8:30.

CDBG Entitlements - Kenneth A. Mix, Planning and Community Development Coordinator

Mr. Mix addressed Council explaining that he will discuss what CDBG is, what types of things can be funded and how it can be implemented. He referred to the prepared PowerPoint presentation (paper copy on file in the Office of the City Clerk.) Mr. Mix noted that the City must compete with an annual application but as an entitlement community, the annual allocation estimated for 2014 is \$769,785 which comes directly from HUD. He reviewed the City's obligations, some of which are new. The annual schedule matches the City's fiscal year, he said, and he pointed out the various deadlines that must be met throughout the year. When spending the funds, he said all money has to meet one of three national objectives including benefitting low- and moderate-income (LMI) people, aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight or meet a need having a particular urgency. Mr. Mix pointed out that 70% of the funds must be spent on the first objective. He reviewed the LMI limits and categories. Mr. Mix spoke about the slums and blight categories, which can be done on an area basis or spot basis. For the area basis, Council would have to pass an Ordinance designating certain areas as slum or blight areas. There are criteria and regulations for that, such as how the area looks in terms of having run down buildings. The spot basis consists more of health and safety issues, he said. He explained how the funds could be used in regard to housing issues, which included various types of rehabilitation and services.

Certain public facilities and improvements can utilize the funds and Mr. Mix explained what can be done in those categories. He said the City can contract with public service providers to provide services but they must be brand new or have quantifiable increases in existing services. He reviewed economic development activities. Planning and administration is limited to 20% of the funds, which includes various annual plans and general management and submission of applications for federal programs.

Mayor Graham asked if the money for planning and administration can be used to offset the costs of the Planning Department.

Mr. Mix said they could be used for that. He then reviewed the list of ineligible activities. He further explained how the City will meet its administrative obligations and noted after the program has started he recommends hiring at least one other staff member to carry out several duties, including compliance issues, reporting and development of future plans. The individual would be a member of the planning office and the salary would be offsetting revenue directly from the grant to pay for the position. He reviewed how the City is going to deliver the programs and projects.

Mayor Graham asked if this would be a revival of a position from years ago.

Mr. Mix said back then, the City had a four person CDBG staff and they actually delivered the programs.

Mayor Graham questioned if other entities in the City that are familiar with these types of grants will be in competition with the City for the money.

Mr. Mix said that could be the case.

Mayor Graham said he would like to see some initiatives done that the City might not do otherwise, like cleaning up something that is highly visible.

Mr. Mix said \$750,000 can go very quickly, especially if infrastructure is involved. In the past, the CDBG program did comprehensive grants, he said, and in addition to housing, the program also helped cover work on sewer and water lines on streets, with some contributions from the City.

When a neighborhood is being labeled as a slum, Mayor Graham said not everyone will like that title.

Council Member Burns agreed that is a slippery slope, and added that there certainly are some areas within the community that are in more need than others. The CDBG grants are traditionally administered through Neighbors of Watertown, she said, and noted that she does not see that changing and is not sure how she can support hiring a new staff member in the Planning Department to just work with Neighbors of Watertown to decide what is going to be done with the funds. If a new staff person is hired, it would have to be a totally different outlook on what is going to be done with the funds, she said.

Mayor Graham noted that he is not in favor of spending that amount of money on a staff person, even if it is reimbursed, to basically administer the remaining funds. He questioned if it would be better to use a third party administrator, such as Camoin, to get the process started.

Mr. Mix replied that the grant will end up paying for it one way or another.

Council Member Butler said he is trying to understand what the duties would be of that new individual on a day to day basis.

It is a little difficult to say exactly what the person would be doing on a day to day agenda, he said, but it has come up before in discussion about the possibility of hiring a consultant when it would be feasible to hiring a staff member for the same function. He said there has been some hesitance in the past because funding has never been definite but this a guaranteed stream of funds.

Council Member Macaluso asked if that new individual would have to answer to Mr. Mix.

Council Member Burns said she believes so.

Council Member Macaluso said even if it was sub-contracted out, there would still have to be communication with Mr. Mix and she said she agrees with him, in that there should be someone on staff working with him to administer those grants. She said this has to be looked at in a new light because it is not the old standards, this money is being handed over and it is nice if the City can keep control of it by having a person on staff to facilitate that.

Council Member Burns mentioned that the City is an entitlement community now and this is new to us, and asked if there is any certainty as to how long the City will keep this status and how long the funds will be guaranteed to the City.

Mr. Mix responded that he does not know if there is any guarantee and noted that Auburn, New York, became ineligible but continued to receive their entitlement. He said the first payment is due July 1, 2014, so the City could start making expenditures in July.

Council Member Burns questioned if other communities would be receiving funding at the same level annually.

Mr. Mix said the payment is not sporadic, but you may see a general trend downward over the years.

Mayor Graham commented that he is unsure how he feels about the new position and asked if a decision needed to be made tonight.

Mr. Mix said the sooner the City starts applying for it, the better.

Mayor Graham said staff and Council will await the Manager's recommendation as well.

Council Member Butler noted in terms of the City's obligations, he inquired about the amount of time and effort that goes in to the action plan and what a good consolidated plan looks like and whether or not someone has to be hired or if a third party could be utilized.

Council Member Jennings commented that he was unclear about how the priorities were determined, and inquired if that is part of the planning process.

Mr. Mix replied that there is a lot of information to be gathered, then plans are put together and brought before Council to see what their preferences are.

Council Member Butler said there is a process of competition and funds would usually flow to certain areas, which happened to be downtown rehabilitation over the last several years. This changes the game, he said, and now things like neighborhood blight can be targeted. He mentioned the properties on Coffeen Street by the old jail which have been there for many years, and that he would like to see those be torn down and replaced with new structures that are more viable for the community.

Council Member Burns agreed that it does give the City more latitude but that when it comes to acquiring property and to demolition, the money goes very quickly.

City Court Requirements - Kurt W. Hauk, City Engineer

Mayor Graham offered some background on the need for the expansion, based on the addition of a second full-time judge in City Court, mandated by the State. The State took over the running of courts back in the 1970s or 1980s and took over the personnel and operating costs with the provision that localities have to provide the venue, Mayor Graham said. He added that the Office of Court Administration and the Chief Justice devised the parameters for the court rooms, including size and an emphasis on security.

Mr. Hauk noted this is more of an update for Council after the meeting last week with State officials and said he would like to explain the process as he understands it for now and that there will be a lot more to follow. He pointed out the two diagrams, one is the current layout of the first floor of City Hall and the other reflects the proposed plan for the new court room. The existing office space used by the court now would become the second court room and noted that the area which used to be used by the police department as cells would be the new office area. He mentioned the square foot requirements for the new court room (1,200 sq. ft. minimum) and the reconfigured office space. The proposed court room would have two different ceiling levels because of the placement of duct work. He pointed out the new secure prisoner holding area, which is required. Another new addition is the prisoner access ramp, which is not required but is one year out from the City's capital plan and it makes sense to add it while the court area is being reconstructed. Mr. Hauk said the parking issue has been highlighted to the State Court System and their response is that it is not their concern. Since security is a concern, he said, the Sterling Street entrance is set to have security posted there. There may be some opportunities to take some space from the existing court room if needed, he said.

Mayor Graham noted that if security is at the side entrance, it would be an enhancement to the building.

Mr. Hauk said it is a matter of having security on the Sterling Street side, then perhaps the front door to the building would be exit only. The details of that have not been worked out yet, he said. The initial submittal to the State would show the basic feasibility of the court and the City Hall facility.

Mayor Graham questioned where the customer window would be located under the new layout.

Mr. Hauk answered the payment window would be located in the secure area by the general court office space. He said initial submittal of the floor plan needs to be submitted by February 28, 2014.

Council Member Butler said he assumes this plan is driven by the necessity of the 1,200 sq. ft. court room and that the other plans were let go because of the square footage requirement.

Mr. Hauk replied that the square footage requirement knocked out the Codes office area and the storage area behind the existing court room. The new court room does not affect the POMCO office, but it may be affected depending on square foot requirements. Discussion centered around the usage of the cells, showers and restroom facilities. Mr. Hauk noted that the good news is that the entire first floor does not have to be gutted, which was first thought after the square footage figures were calculated.

Council Member Macaluso asked what the estimated cost of the project will be.

Mr. Hauk answered that he thinks it will be \$1.5 million, because there will be a lot of asbestos removal and there are a lot of utilities, duct work, piping, etc., that need to be removed and relocated to facilitate that area as a court room. Due to the fact that everything in the building is 30 to 40 years old, the magnitude of the project is unknown.

Mayor Graham asked if any of this can be done in house.

Mr. Hauk said that it could be done in phases, and the question is what the court system will allow the City to do. It was suggested that the office area be done first to get the employees in their new offices. He said he does not want to get too far ahead until he knows that the Court will accept what is being proposed.

Mayor Graham commented that this proposal meets their general requirements but is the least disruptive to the building.

Mr. Hauk replied it was. Once the basic plan is approved, he said, it will be submitted to someone who designs court rooms and get some plans that will be finalized to get the work going.

Council Member Butler commented that Mr. Hauk did a good job.

Work session ended at 9:23 p.m.

Amanda C. Lewis
Deputy City Clerk